



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,622	01/22/2004	William Wesley Jenkins	CCS-102/Clarity CSI FlexA	5053
32205	7590	02/20/2007	EXAMINER	
CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC ONE NORTH LASALLE STREET 44TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60602			WIN, AUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/762,622	JENKINS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aung T. Win	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 20-39, 45 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-19 and 40-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 20-39, 45& 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "storing an initial voice message associated with an incoming call to the first mobile terminal". As recited in the claim, the voice message is already stored in the first mobile terminal. Claim 1 further recites "not automatically transmitting the initial voice message to the first mobile terminal from the communication server". It is unclear how is already stored voice message in the first mobile terminal transmitted from the communication server to the first mobile terminal. Examiner requests the applicant specify the drawing, page, column or line number, which support the claims' limitations. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. In light of 112 Claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahod et al. US (US 20040224678A1) in view of Markki et al. (US20040127203A1).

Claims 20-23, 25-33, 35-39 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahod et al. US (US 20040224678A1) in view of Markki et al. (US20040127203A1).

1.1 Regarding Claim 1, Dahod discloses a method implemented by a push-to-talk (PTT) mobile terminal [See background, summary & Figures] for communicating voice information. The method comprises storing initial voice message of a caller in the voice mail system if the receiving user of the PTT mobile terminal does not answer the PTT call [0036, 0037, 0044]. Dahod's method does not transmit initial voice message to the receiving PPT mobile terminal automatically. Such feature is also well known in the art since the conventional PTT call method also send the alert to the user before sending

Art Unit: 2617

the initial voice message. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that telephone network comprises call processing server as claimed to process the calls.

Dahod's does not explicitly teach transmitting selectable acceptance management call control request message.

Markki discloses the incoming call processing method comprising call processing server for processing the incoming call based on profile data inputted by user of the mobile terminal [Profile data in call preference database 104: Figure 1]. Markki teaches that mobile transmit profile data to the remote call preference database to set up the user preferred call treatment based on user action [0009, 0019-0022 & 0026] (reads on first determining step as claimed) and the call processing server determine if there is profile data in the call preference database prior to processing the call (reads on second determining step as claimed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to modify Dahod's method as claimed by implementing user preferred call treatment set up method as taught by Markki [transmitting profile data or deleting profile data: 102; Figure 1]. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to provide improved future incoming call treatment feature according to user preference such as by creating profile data with different call alerts.

1.2 Claim 7 is an apparatus claim rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 1 rejection because claimed means substantially read on the corresponding

method of Claim 1.

1.3 Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 1 rejection because claimed method substantially read on the corresponding method of Claim 1. Modified method teaches updating user profile data and call processing server processes call based on updated profile data.

1.4 Claim 30 is also rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 1, 7 and 20 rejections. It is obvious to skill in the art that that modified processing communication server must be implemented with claimed means in order to process the method claimed in Claim 20.

1.5 Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11 & 12 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 1 and 7 rejections. The modified call processing server processes the call in default behavior if there is no stored profile data in the remote preference database wherein profile data comprises different alerts [Markki: 0028] [Dahod: 0049]. The modified method teaches accepting the call by retrieving stored voice message (i.e., claimed user second input).

1.6 Claims 3, 9, 21, 23, 31 & 33 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 1, 7, 20 & 30 rejections. The modified method teaches the second user input as

claimed i.e., answering the call [Dahod: 0044-0046].

1.7 Claims 4 & 10, 22, 25, 32 & 35 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 1 & 7 rejections because claimed limitations are substantially close to corresponding ones of Claims 1 & 7. Dahod disclosed that SMS notification message is delivered in **some** embodiments to the sender [Dahod: 0045]. Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such message status notification message is the design choice and such feature does not constitute the patentably distinct limitation because such feature is within the scope of modified method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement modified method without providing message status notification to the sender as claimed for the service provider to provide the communication method based on client choice.

1.8 Claims 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 37, 38 & 39 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 20 & 30 rejections. Modified method teaches aborting the PTT communication sessions between terminals if the receiving terminal does not reply in predetermined time (i.e, the time required to establish the PTT communication session) [Dahod: 0032, 0036, 0044] and further deleting initial stored voice message. Modified method also teaches establishing the PTT communication sessions between terminal if the receiving terminal reply in predetermined time [See cited disclosure of PTT

communication session establishment; Dahod's reference].

2. Claim 24 & 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahod et al. US (US 20040224678A1) in view of Markki et al. (US20040127203A1), further in view of Mathis (US 20030119540A1).

2.1 Regarding Claims 24 & 34, modified method fails to teach claimed transmitting steps. Mathis teaches claimed transmitting steps i.e., transmitting a presence status update message to mobile terminals for displaying on the mobile terminals [See Pictures and related disclosures].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made further modify the method to provide present status information to mobile terminals as taught by Mathis. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to provide improved and resource efficient PTT system by avoiding unnecessary PTT call requests by the PTT requesting terminal.

3. Claims 45 & 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahod et al. US (US 20040224678A1) in view of Markki et al. (US20040127203A1).

3.1 Regarding Claims 45 & 46, Dahod discloses Push-to-talk (PTT) communication method by PTT mobile terminal by setting up PTT voice communication link [See Figures] [Paragraph 0028 & 0029]. The method comprises

PTT mobile terminal's user (second mobile terminal) requests to send a voice message [sender request signal indicating the user wants to transmit voice message to the receiving PTT mobile terminal: 0019, 0028] [Media Gateway or Media Server: 0032];

Storing the transmitted voice message [0028];

Transmitting an incoming call alert message to the receiving PTT mobile terminal [0045] and

Further transmitting the stored voice message to the receiving PTT mobile terminal (first mobile terminal) [0029] based on call by call basis [accept, delete, or forward, etc. 0045]. Dahod does not explicitly teach storing the presence state associated with the receiving PTT mobile terminal to reflect the future incoming calls.

Markki discloses the incoming call processing method comprising call processing server for processing the incoming call based on profile data inputted by user of the mobile terminal [Profile data in call preference database 104: Figure 1] (reads on storing a presence state to reflect future incoming calls to the receiving mobile terminal). Markki teaches that mobile transmits profile data to the remote call preference database to set up the user preferred call treatment based on user action [0009, 0019-0022 & 0026] (reads on first determining step as claimed) and the call processing server determine if there is profile data in the call preference database prior to processing the call (reads on second determining step as claimed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to modify Dahod's method as claimed by implementing user preferred call treatment set up method as taught by Markki [transmitting profile data or deleting profile data: 102; Figure 1]. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to provide improved future incoming call treatment feature according to user preference and presence state information.

Moreover, Dahod disclosed that SMS notification message is delivered in **some** embodiments to the sender [Dahod: 0045]. Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such message status notification message is the design choice and such feature does not constitute the patentably distinct limitation because such feature is within the scope of modified method. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement modified method without providing message status notification to the sender as claimed for the service provider to provide the communication method based on client choice.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aung T. Win whose telephone number is (571) 272-7549. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aung T. Win
Group Art Unit 2617
February 12, 2007


DUC M. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600